

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011

Applicant	San Bernardino County Flood Control District	Amount Requested	\$16,173,493
------------------	--	-------------------------	--------------

Proposal Title	Cactus Basins 3, 4, and 5	Total Proposal Cost	\$34,346,985
-----------------------	---------------------------	----------------------------	--------------

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

The San Bernardino County Flood Control District proposes the construction of three unlined retention basins near the City of Rialto. The main objective of the proposed project is to eliminate any potential increase in flood hazard due to extensive development in the northern portion of the watershed. Cactus Basins 3, 4, and 5 could aid in providing adequate stormwater infrastructure to the City of Rialto's primary commercial/industrial area. The current downstream system is at capacity and is unable to accommodate planned development of the area. These basins could provide flood protection not only to the immediate vicinity, but also to the areas downstream. The basins could create a reduction in the peak outlet flow to the downstream system. This reduction would allow the outlet and downstream facilities to flow at a lower peak rate, and therefore be designed with smaller maximum capacities. Secondary benefits may include the potential for the increased groundwater recharge (estimated at 15,000 acre-feet per year) and improved water quality due to decreased floodwater contamination.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Points Possible	Criteria	Score/ Points Possible
Work Plan	3/15	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits	9/12
Budget	3/5	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	0/12
Schedule	1/5	Program Preferences	6/10
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	2/5		
Total Score (max. possible = 64)			24

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Work Plan

The Work Plan criterion is minimally addressed and not documented. The PSP requirements for a Work Plan Introduction are not provided, including goals and objectives; purpose and need; project list; regional and project map; completed work; existing data and studies; project specifics; and project timing and

phasing. The Tasks that will be performed to implement the project are inadequately detailed and incomplete. It is not clear what the scope of the project includes and whether it can be implemented. Further, the Proposal does not include a discussion of the technical feasibility of the project and no supporting technical documentation is provided. For example, Task 5 Final Design states construction plans are at 60% and will be provided as part of the application package; however, no plans or drawings are included.

Budget

The Budgets for most of the projects in the Proposal have detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4, but not all costs appear reasonable or supporting documentation is lacking for a majority of the items shown in the Budget categories described in Exhibit B. For example, while a summary Budget is provided, which includes the Budget categories specified in PSP Attachment 4, the Budget is not broken down by the Tasks described in the Work Plan. An Engineer's Estimate is provided for each of the three basins, which includes detailed quantities/lump sums costs/unit prices. While the Engineer's Estimate of construction contract cost generally agrees with the dollar amount shown in Budget category "(d) Construction/Implementation" in Table 6, there is no way to determine if the detailed costs shown are reasonable, as the Proposal's Work Plan lacks significant construction detail. Also, costs for other Budget categories consist of costs already accrued (dates appear to be mostly in the past) and no estimates of future costs for work not completed or proposed work are included. The limited Budget discussion does not clarify any of the issues indicated. Lastly, the Budget cannot be easily correlated to the Schedule or Work Plan, as consistent task names and/or task numbers are not used.

Schedule

The Schedule does not follow the work items presented in the Work Plan and Budget, is clearly not reasonable. Also, the Schedule demonstrates a readiness to begin construction more than 12 months after the anticipated grant award date (October 1, 2011).

Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

The Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. For example, discussion of the project performance measures is not provided and insufficient information on where the data will be collected and the types of analyses to be used. The required Project Performance Measures Table is provided that includes project goals, desired outcomes, output/outcome indicators, measurement tools, and methods and targets; however, numbers within the table are not in agreement. For example, for Environmental Mitigation, 45 acres of off-site mitigation land is a Target, but the Output Indicator and Measurement Tools indicate 40 acres of mitigated land. Also, for Ecosystem Restoration, the provided Target is 2.67 acres of re-vegetated land, whereas the Output Indicator and Measurement Tools indicate 0.8 acres. Additionally, the Output Indicator provided for Groundwater Recharge is vague and not quantified.

Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction (FDR) and Water Supply Benefits

Average levels of FDR benefits can be realized through this Proposal; however, the quality of the analysis and supporting documentation are insufficient. Detailed input and output tables of benefits from a flood risk analysis model are provided, but the numbers in Tables 11 and 12 do not appear to match any in the model tables. The supporting flood inundation maps or other analysis to generate the data are not included. Water Supply Benefits are not claimed.

Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits

This criterion is not addressed. No Economic Analysis of Water Quality or Other Expected benefits are included in the Application.

Program Preferences

The Proposal includes a project that implements the following Program Preferences: Regional Project, Effectively Integrate Water Management and Land Use Planning, and Practice Integrated Flood Management. However, the Proposal demonstrates a limited degree of certainty that the Program Preferences claimed can be achieved, and lacks thorough documentation for the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preferences to be implemented.